REMARKS

Claims 1-37 and 57-62 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated February 21, 2007, claims 1-37 and 57-62 were rejected. Applicants address the Examiner's comments below. Applicants are amending claims 1 and 57 in this Amendment and Response and canceling claims 2 and 58. In view of the Amendments herein and the Remarks that follow, Applicants respectfully request that Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 and 57 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,633,723 to Sugiyama in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,226 to Ishikawa. This rejection is now traversed.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

> A printer for printing time-based media, the printer comprising:
>
> a media processing system embedded within the printer for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media;
>
> an electronic output system for producing a document on a media from the electronic representation of the time-based media;
>
> a housing for supporting an interface for transferring the time-based media between the printer and an external processing system, and for supporting the electronic output system in communication with the media processing system to receive the electronic representation;
>
> a resource allocation module embedded within the printer for determining processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system; and
>
> a task policy manager for determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks.

Claim 57, as amended, recites:

A method for printing time-based media in a printer for printing time-based media comprising a media processing system for generating an electronic representation of the time-based media, the method comprising:

receiving user input indicating selection of one or more media processing resources from among resources of the printer and an external processing system;

determining, processing allocation for one or more tasks among the printer and the external processing system;

determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more task, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks; and

determining the electronic representation of the time-based media using the determined allocation of resources.

Sugiyama is directed to a video printer, while Ishikawa discusses a printing system that contains a "dumb" printer and parallel processors. The references fail to disclose or suggest,

"...determining whether the printer will interact with the external processing system as a master or as a slave to process the one or more tasks, the determination based on a policy stored in association with the one or more tasks..."

The Examiner acknowledges in paragraph 5 of the Office Action dated September 12, 2007 that Sugiyama in view of Ishikawa does not expressly disclose that said resource allocation module determines whether said printer resource interacts as a master or as a slave with said external system but indicates that Gropp allegedly discloses the limitation. Gropp discloses parallel programming using a message passing interface. In the cited section, Gropp discloses that "a master process is responsible for coordinating the work of the others." Slave processes do not communicate with each other but rather each communicates only with the master. (Gropp, p. 35).

The references fail to disclose or suggest determining whether the printer interacts with the external processing system as a master or a slave. Rather, the combination of references at best yields a printer that communicates with a processing device using a master-slave message passing interface. However, there is no suggestion that the system determines if the printer interacts with the processing system as a master or a slave based on a policy stored in association with the task. Rather, the master-slave relationship would be fixed and remain the same regardless of the task. Therefore, even if Ishikawa, Sugiyama, and Gropp could be combined, the combination still does not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 57 are patentably distinguishable over the cited references.

As claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are dependent on claim 1, all arguments advanced above with respect to claim 1 also apply to claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 4-5, 8, 11, 17, 19, 34-37 are also patentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa, both alone and in combination for at least the reasons recited above.

In the 4th-15th paragraphs of the Office Action, the remaining dependent claims have further been rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sugiyama and Ishikawa in various combinations with U.S. Patent No. 6,308,887 B1 to Korman; U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0220988 A1 to Hymel; U.S. Patent No. 5,936,542 to Kleinrock; U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0010641 A1 to Stevens; U.S. Patent No. 6,296,693 B1 to McCarthy; U.S. Patent No. 5,170,935 to Federspiel; U.S. Patent No. 5,940,776 to Baron; and U.S. Patent No. 6,118,888 to Chino; U.S. Patent No. 5,568,406 to Gerber; U.S. Patent No. 5,270,989 to Kimura; U.S. Patent No. 5,136,363 to Takemasa; U.S. Patent No. 4,734,898 to Morinaga; and U.S. Patent No. 6,000,030 to Steinberg.

The cited references each fail to disclose or suggest all of the claimed limitations previously discussed. Furthermore, the dependent claims recite additional elements that also are patentably distinguishable from all cited combinations of the above references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections to the remaining dependent claims and withdraw them.

Conclusion

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1, 3-37, 57, and 59-62, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them. In addition, Applicants respectfully invite the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the number provided below if the Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
Peter E. Hart, Jonathan J. Hull, Jamey Graham and Kurt Piersol

Date: ___December 12, 2007___

By: ___/Jason E. Amsel/___
Jason E. Amsel, Patent Agent
Reg. No. 60,650
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7692
Fax: (650) 938-5200

20412/08457/DOCS/1812265.1